



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/755,365	01/05/2001	Adriaan Johannes Rijnberg	PHNL000014	3887
24737	7590	02/22/2006	EXAMINER	
PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS			CORRIELUS, JEAN B	
P.O. BOX 3001			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510			2637	

DATE MAILED: 02/22/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

S~

**Advisory Action
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No.

09/755,365

Applicant(s)

RIJNBERG ET AL.

Examiner

Jean B. Corrielus

Art Unit

2637

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 09 February 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) The period for reply expires 4 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
 b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
- (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 - (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
 - (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 - (d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).

5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.

6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____.

Claim(s) objected to: 5, 9 and 17.

Claim(s) rejected: 1-4, 6, 7, 13-16 and 18.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet.

12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____

13. Other: _____.


 Jean B Corrielus
 Primary Examiner
 Art Unit: 2637

2-17-06

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments filed 2/9/06 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. It is alleged that Honda teaches only the smoothing of the phase equalization coefficients rather than the smoothing of the prediction coefficients. As previously stated in the final office action, the primary reason Honda was used in the outstanding art rejection is to show that smoothing of filter coefficients is old and well established in the art. Whether the coefficients are prediction coefficients or "phase equalization coefficients, the function of the smoothing means/step would still be the same, i.e. generating smoothed coefficient output. In other word, given the teaching of smoothing coefficients of Honda, one skill in the art would have been motivated to modify the admitted prior art to smooth the prediction coefficients, as indicated in the last office action for the reasons given by Honda. For the sake of argument, note however that the output of the equalization filter is a filtered prediction signal see Honda col. 4, lines 33-34 then the coefficients generated by the smoothing means have to be prediction coefficients. Applicant further argued that the smoothing of the equalization coefficients by Honda is not equivalent to smoothing of prediction coefficients as claimed. Examiner disagrees because the smoothing as taught by Honda and the smoothing as claimed by applicant have to be equivalent since each smoothing results in a "smoothed prediction coefficients" being generated. In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, the motivation to combine the references was found in Honda see for instance col. 2, lines 45-48 and col. 9, lines 47-61. In addition, the argument made in reference to Shimoni et al is moot as the smoothing of the coefficients has been addressed with reference to Honda. Note that the low pass filter, FIR and IIR filters were introduced in the last office action to show that it is well known practice to implement a smoothing means as low pass filter, FIR and IIR. The smoothing of coefficients is taught by the primary reference.